




provides for discretionary fee exemptions for indigents. In considering granting an exemption, courts must find that those seeking an exemption have demonstrated that an exemption is necessary in order to avoid unreasonable burdens and to promote public access to information. “Exemptions from PACER user fees are uncommon [and] [i]n forma pauperis status alone does not support a request to waive PACER fees.” Katumbusi v. Gary, 2014 WL 5698816, at \*4 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2014).

Plaintiff, as a *pro se* litigant, has been provided paper copies of all pleadings, documents, and orders in his case pursuant to this Court’s Administrative Procedures Governing Filing and Service by Electronic Means.<sup>2</sup> His mother can obtain free PACER access to judicial opinions, information and documents viewed at courthouse public access terminals. Moreover, Plaintiff is presently represented by NCPLS for purposes of discovery and can, presumably, access any relevant documents through counsel. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that a discretionary fee exception is necessary and, therefore, his Motion seeking fee PACER access will be denied.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Free Access to PACER, (Doc. No. 66), is **DENIED**.

Signed: March 21, 2020

  
Frank D. Whitney  
Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>2</sup> See [https://www.ncwd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/general-orders/ADMINORDER\\_2.pdf](https://www.ncwd.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/general-orders/ADMINORDER_2.pdf) (rev. Jan. 1, 2018).